arXiv:1402.2362v1 [math.DG] 11 Feb 2014

TRANSLATION HYPERSURFACES WITH CONSTANT S_r CURVATURE IN THE EUCLIDEAN SPACE

B. P. LIMA[1], N. L. SANTOS[2], J. P. SILVA[3], AND P. SOUSA[4]

Abstract. In this paper, we give a complete description of all translation hypersurfaces with constant r-curvature S_r, in the Euclidean space.

1. Introduction and Statement of Results

In the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$, a surface M^2 is called a translation surface if it is given by an immersion

$$\Psi : U \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^3 : \Psi(x, y) = (x, y, z(x, y))$$

where $z(x, y) = f(x)+g(y)$, for f and g smooth functions of a single variable, that is, Ψ is obtained as an Euclidean translation of the smooth curve, $\alpha(x) = (x, 0, f(x))$, pointwisely along the curve $\beta(y) = (0, y, g(y))$. Scherk [8] proved in 1835 that, besides the planes, the only minimal translation surfaces are the surfaces given by

$$z(x, y) = \frac{1}{a} \ln \left| \frac{\cos(ay)}{\cos(ax)} \right|$$

where a is a nonzero constant. This surface, unique up to similarities, is called Scherk's surface. The concept of translation surfaces was generalized to hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by Dillen, Verstraelen and Zafindratafa [3], they obtained a classification of minimal translation hypersurfaces of the $(n + 1)$-dimensional Euclidean space.

Definition 1. *We say that a hypersurface M^n of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a translation hypersurface if it is the graph of a function given by*

$$F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f_1(x_1) + \ldots + f_n(x_n)$$

where $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ are cartesian coordinates and f_i is a smooth function of one real variable for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

That is, M^n can be thought as a composition of plane curves given by graphs, that is: denote by $\alpha_i(t_i) = t_i e_i + f_i(t_i)e_{n+1}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, a family of plane curves, actually, graphs. For $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ denote by $L_p : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, the translation through p, given by $L_p(q) = p + q$. Then, the map ψ above is given by

$$(x_1, \ldots x_n) \mapsto L_{\alpha_1(x_1)} \circ \ldots \circ L_{\alpha_{n-1}(x_{n-1})}(\alpha_n(x_n)).$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C42; Secondary 53A07, 53B20.

Key words and phrases. Translation Hypersurfaces, S_r Curvature.

The first, second and third author are partially supported by CAPES/Brazil. The fourth author is partially supported by CAPES and CNPq/Brazil.

Another extension was obtained by R. López, in [7], where it is introduced the concept of translation surfaces in the 3-dimensional hyperbolic space and it is presented a classification of minimal translation surfaces.

In a different aspect, Liu [6] considered the translation surfaces with constant mean curvature in 3-dimensional Euclidean space and Lorentz-Minkowski space. A classification of translation hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature in $(n+1)$-dimensional Euclidean space was made by Chen, Sun and Tang [2].

Now, let $M^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be an oriented hypersurface and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ denote the principal curvatures of M^n. We can consider similar problems related with the r-th elementary symmetric polynomials, S_r, given by $S_r = \sum \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_r}$, where $r = 1, \ldots, n$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n$. In particular, S_1 is the mean curvature, S_2 the scalar curvature and S_n the Gauss-Kronecker curvature, up to normalization factors. A very useful relationship involving the various S_r is given by the next proposition, (Proposition 1, from [1]). This result will play a central role along this paper.

Proposition 1 (Caminha, 2006 [1])**.** *Let $n > 1$ be an integer, and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ be real numbers. Define, for $0 \leq r \leq n$, $S_r = S_r(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ as above, and set $H_r = H_r(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} S_r(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$*

(a) For $1 \leq r \leq n$, one has $H_r^2 \geq H_{r-1} H_{r+1}$. Moreover, if equality happens for $r = 1$ or for some $1 < r < n$, with $H_{r+1} \neq 0$ in this case, then $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_n$.

(b) If $H_1, H_2, \ldots H_r > 0$ for some $1 < r \leq n$, then

$$H_1 \geq \sqrt{H_2} \geq \sqrt[3]{H_3} \geq \cdots \geq \sqrt[r]{H_r}\,.$$

Moreover, if equality happens for some $1 \leq j < r$, then $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_n$.

(c) If for some $1 \leq r < n$, one has $H_r = H_{r+1} = 0$, then $H_j = 0$ for all $r \leq j \leq n$. In particular, at most $r - 1$ of the λ_i are different from zero.

In [4], M. L. Leite gave a new example of a translation hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^4$ with zero scalar curvature. And, in [5], Lima, Santos and Sousa presented a complete description of all translation hypersurfaces with zero scalar curvature in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. In this paper, we obtain a complete classification of translation hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $S_r = 0$. We prove the following

Theorem 1. *Let M^n $(n \geq 3)$ be a translation hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then, for $2 < r < n$, M^n has zero S_r curvature if, and only if, it is congruent to the graph of the following functions*

- $F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1} a_i x_i + \sum_{j=n-r+2}^{n} f_j(x_j) + b,$

on $\mathbb{R}^{n-r+1} \times J_{n-r+2} \times \cdots \times J_n$, for some intervals $J_{n-r+2}, \ldots, J_n$, and arbitrary smooth functions $f_i : J_i \subset \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Which defines, after a suitable linear change of variables, a vertical cylinder, and

- *A generalized periodic Enneper hypersurface given by*

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1,\dots,x_n) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-r-1} a_i x_i \\ &+ \sum_{k=n-r}^{n-1} \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{a_k} \ln\left| \frac{\cos\left(-\dfrac{a_{n-r}\dots a_{n-1}}{\sigma_{r-1}(a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1})}\sqrt{\beta}x_n + b_n\right)}{\cos(a_k\sqrt{\beta}x_k + b_k)} \right| + c \end{aligned}$$

on $\mathbb{R}^{n-r-1}\times I_{n-r}\times\cdots\times I_n$*, where* $a_1,\dots,a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1},b_{n-r},\dots,b_n$ *and* c *are real constants where* $a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1}$ *and* $\sigma_{r-1}(a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1})$ *nonzero,* $\beta = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-r-1} a_i^2$*,* $I_k\,(n-r\le k\le n-1)$ *are open intervals defined by the conditions* $|a_k\sqrt{\beta}x_k + b_k| < \pi/2$ *while* I_n *is defined by* $\left|-\dfrac{a_{n-r}\dots a_{n-1}}{\sigma_{r-1}(a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1})}\sqrt{\beta}x_n + b_n\right| < \pi/2$.

Recently, Seo [9] gave a classification of the translation hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature or constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature in Euclidean space. Particularly, he proved that if M is a translation hypersurface with constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature GK in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then M is congruent to a cylinder, and hence $GK = 0$. In [5], Lima, Santos and Sousa proved that given any integer $n \ge 3$, any translation hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with constant scalar curvature must have zero scalar curvature. In this work, we generalize these results to the curvatures S_r. Precisely, we prove the following

Theorem 2. *Any translation hypersurface in* $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\,(n\ge 3)$ *with* S_r *constant, for* $2 < r < n$*, must have* $S_r = 0$*.*

2. Preliminaries and basic results

Let $\overline{M}^{n+1}$ be a connected Riemannian manifold. In the remainder of this paper, we will be concerned with isometric immersions, $\Psi : M^n \to \overline{M}^{n+1}$, from a connected, n-dimensional orientable Riemannian manifold, M^n, into $\overline{M}^{n+1}$. We fix an orientation of M^n, by choosing a globally defined unit normal vector field, N, on M. Denote by A, the corresponding shape operator. At each $p \in M$, A restricts to a self-adjoint linear map $A_p : T_pM \to T_pM$. For each $1 \le r \le n$, let $S_r : M^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be the smooth function such that $S_r(p)$ denotes the r-th elementary symmetric function on the eigenvalues of A_p, which can be defined by the identity

$$\det(A_p - \lambda I) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^{n-k} S_k(p)\lambda^{n-k}. \tag{1}$$

where $S_0 = 1$ by definition. If $p \in M^n$ and $\{e_l\}$ is a basis of T_pM, given by eigenvectors of A_p, with corresponding eigenvalues $\{\lambda_l\}$, one immediately sees that

$$S_r = \sigma_r(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n),$$

where $\sigma_r \in \mathbb{R}[X_1,\dots,X_n]$ is the r-th elementary symmetric polynomial on $X_1,\dots,X_n$. Consequently,

$$S_r = \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_r\le n} \lambda_{i_1}\cdots\lambda_{i_r}, \text{ where } r = 1,\dots,n.$$

In the next result we present an expression for the curvature S_r of a translation hypersurface in the Euclidean space. This expression will play an essential role in this paper.

Proposition 2. *Let $F : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function, defined as follows $F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$, where each f_i is a smooth function of one real variable. Let M^n be the graphic of F, given in coordinates by*

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i e_i + F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) e_{n+1} \tag{2}$$

The S_r curvature of M^n is given by

$$S_r = \frac{1}{W^{r+2}} \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_r \leq n}^{n} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r} (1 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq n \\ m \neq i_1 \ldots i_r}} \dot{f}_m^2), \tag{3}$$

where the dot represents derivative with respect to the corresponding variable, that is, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$, one has $\dot{f}_j = \dfrac{df_j}{dx_j}(x_j) = \dfrac{\partial F}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Proof. Let F be as stated in the Proposition, denote by $\nabla F = \sum_{i=1}^n \dfrac{\partial F}{\partial x^i}\, e_i$ the Euclidean gradient of F and $<,>$ the standard Euclidean inner product. Then, we have

$$\nabla F = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \dot{f}_i \; e_i$$

and the coordinate vector fields associated to the parametrization given in (2) have the following form

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_m} = e_m + \dot{f}_m e_{n+1}, \quad m = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Hence, the elements G_{ij} of the metric of M^n are given by

$$G_{ij} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x^i}, \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x^j} \right\rangle = \delta_{ij} + \dot{f}_i \dot{f}_j,$$

implying that the matrix of the metric G has the following form

$$G = I_n + (\nabla F)^t \; \nabla F,$$

where I_n is the identity matrix of order n. Note that the i-th column of G, which will be denoted by G^i has the expression given by the column vector

$$G^i = e_i + \dot{f}_i \nabla F. \tag{4}$$

An easy calculation shows that the unitary normal vector field ξ of M^n satisfies

$$W\xi = e_{n+1} - \nabla F,$$

where $W^2 = 1 + |\nabla F|^2$. Thus, the second fundamental form B_{ij} of M^n satisfies

$$W B_{ij} = \left\langle W\xi, \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \right\rangle = \left\langle e_{n+1} - \nabla F, \delta_{ij} \ddot{f}_i e_{n+1} \right\rangle = \delta_{ij} \ddot{f}_i,$$

implying that the matrix of B is diagonal

$$B = \frac{1}{W} \cdot \mathrm{diag}(\ddot{f}_1, \ldots, \ddot{f}_n),$$

with i-th column given by the column vector

$$B^i = \frac{\ddot{f}_i}{W}\, e_i. \tag{5}$$

If A denotes the matrix of the Weingarten mapping, then $A = G^{-1}B$. In (1), changing λ by λ^{-1} gives

$$\det(\lambda A - I) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{n-i} S_i \lambda^i.$$

Thus, we conclude that the expression for curvature S_r can be found by the following calculation

$$(-1)^{n-r} S_r = \frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big|_{\lambda=0} \det(\lambda A - I).$$

Note that

$$(-1)^{n-r} \det G \cdot S_r = \det G \cdot \frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big|_{\lambda=0} \det(\lambda A - I) = \frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big|_{\lambda=0} \det(\lambda B - G).$$

Due to the multilinearity of function det, on its n column vectors, it follows immediately that

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\Big|_{\lambda=0} \det\,[\lambda B^1 - G^1, \cdots, \lambda B^n - G^n] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{n-1} \det\,[G^1, \cdots, \underbrace{B^i}_{\text{i-th term}}, \cdots, G^n],$$

leading to the conclusion

$$\frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big|_{\lambda=0} \det\,(\lambda B - G) = \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \ldots < i_r \le n}^{n} (-1)^{n-r} \det\,[G^1, \cdots, B^{i_1}, \cdots, B^{i_r}, \cdots, G^n]$$

and thus

$$S_r = \frac{1}{\det G} \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \cdots < i_r \le n}^{n} \det\,[G^1, \cdots, B^{i_1}, \cdots, B^{i_r}, \cdots, G^n]. \tag{6}$$

Now, applying the expressions (4) and (5) in (6) we reach to the expression

(7)

$$S_r = \frac{1}{\det G \cdot W^r} \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \ldots < i_r \le n}^{n} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r} \det\,[e_1 + f_1' \nabla F, \ldots, e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_r}, \ldots, e_n + f_n' \nabla F].$$

Calculating the determinant on the right in the equality above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det\,[e_1 + \dot{f}_1 \nabla F, \quad \ldots \quad , e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_r}, \ldots, e_n + \dot{f}_n \nabla F] = \\ = \quad 1 + \sum_{i \neq i_1, \ldots, i_r} \dot{f}_i \det\,[e_1, \ldots, e_{i_1}, \ldots, \underbrace{\nabla F}_{i\text{-th term}}, \ldots, e_{i_r}, \ldots, e_n] \\ = \quad 1 + \sum_{\substack{1 \le i \le n \\ i \neq i_1, \ldots, i_r}} \dot{f}_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the expression for S_r in (7) assumes the following form

$$S_r = \frac{1}{\det G \cdot W^r} \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \ldots < i_r \le n}^{n} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r} (1 + \sum_{\substack{1 \le i \le n \\ i \neq i_1, \ldots, i_r}} \dot{f}_i^2).$$

Finally, using that $\det G = W^2$ we obtain the desired expression

$$S_r = \frac{1}{W^{r+2}} \sum_{1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_r\leq n}^{n} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_r}(1+\sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq n\\ i\neq i_1,\ldots,i_r}} \dot{f}_i^2).$$

□

3. Proof of the theorems

In order to prove Theorem 1 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $f_1,\ldots,f_r$ be smooth functions of one real variable satisfying the differential equation*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r} \ddot{f}_1(x_1)\ldots\widehat{\ddot{f}_k(x_k)}\ldots\ddot{f}_r(x_r)(\beta+\dot{f}_k^{\,2}(x_k))=0, \tag{8}$$

where β is a positive real constant and the big hat means an omitted term. If $\ddot{f}_i\neq 0$, for each $i=1,\ldots r$ then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r} f_k(x_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{r-1}\frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{a_k}\ln\left|\frac{\cos\left(-\dfrac{a_1\ldots a_{r-1}}{\sigma_{r-2}(a_1,\ldots,a_{r-1})}\sqrt{\beta}x_r+b_r\right)}{\cos(a_k\sqrt{\beta}x_k+b_k)}\right|+c$$

where a_i,b_i,c, $i=1,\ldots r$ are real constants with $a_i,\sigma_{r-2}(a_1,\ldots,a_{r-1})\neq 0$.

Proof. Since the derivatives $\ddot{f}_i\neq 0$ it follows that $\ddot{f}_1(x_1)\ldots\ddot{f}_r(x_n)\neq 0$. Thus dividing (8) by this product we get the equivalent equation:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r}\frac{\beta+\dot{f}_k^{\,2}(x_k)}{\ddot{f}_k(x_k)}=0,$$

which implies, after taking derivative with respect to x_l for each $l=1,\ldots r$, that $\left(\dfrac{\beta+\dot{f}_l^{\,2}(x_l)}{\ddot{f}_l(x_l)}\right)'=0$, thus $\dfrac{\beta+\dot{f}_l^{\,2}(x_l)}{\ddot{f}_l(x_l)}=\tilde{a}_l$ for some non null constant $\tilde{a}_l$. Thus, setting $a_l=\dfrac{1}{\tilde{a}_l}$

$$\frac{\ddot{f}_l(x_l)}{\beta+\dot{f}_l^{\,2}(x_l)}=a_l \quad \text{for each } l=1,\ldots,r$$

which can be easily solved to give:

$$\arctan\left(\frac{\dot{f}_l(x_l)}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right)=a_l\sqrt{\beta}x+b_l \quad \text{for some constant } b_l$$

and consequently

$$f_l(x_l)=-\frac{1}{a_l}\sqrt{\beta}\ln|\cos(a_l\sqrt{\beta}x_l+b_l)|+c_l,\quad l=1,\ldots,r. \tag{9}$$

Now, since $\sum_{k=1}^{r}\frac{1}{a_k}=0$ it implies that $\frac{1}{a_r}=-\frac{\sigma_{r-2}(a_1,\dots,a_{r-1})}{a_1\dots a_{r-1}}$, from (9) it follows that

$$f_r(x_r)=\frac{\sigma_{r-2}(a_1,\dots,a_{r-1})}{a_1\dots a_{r-1}}\sqrt{\beta}\ln|\cos(a_r\sqrt{\beta}x_r+b_r)|+c_r$$

Consequently

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r}f_k(x_k)=\sum_{k=1}^{r-1}\frac{1}{a_k}\sqrt{\beta}\ln\left|\frac{\cos\left(-\dfrac{a_1\dots a_{r-1}}{\sigma_{r-2}(a_1,\dots,a_{r-1})}\sqrt{\beta}x_r+b_r\right)}{\cos(a_k\sqrt{\beta}x_k+b_k)}\right|+c,$$

where $c=c_1+\ldots+c_r$. □

With this lemma at hand we can go to the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. From Proposition 2, we have that M^n has zero S_r curvature if, and only if,

$$\sum_{1\le i_1<\ldots<i_r\le n}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_r}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{1\le k\le n\\ k\notin\{i_1,\dots i_r\}}}\dot{f}_k^2\Big)=0. \tag{10}$$

In order to ease the analysis, we divide the proof in four cases.

Case 1: Suppose $\ddot{f}_i(x_i)=0$, $\forall\, i=1,\dots,n-r+1$. In this case, we have no restrictions on the functions $f_{n-r+2},\dots,f_n$. Thus

$$\Psi(x_1,\dots,x_n)=(x_1,\dots,x_n,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1}a_ix_i+\sum_{j=n-r+2}^{n}f_j(x_j)+b)$$

where $a_i,b\in\mathbb{R}$ and for $l=n-r+2,\dots,n$, the functions $f_l:I_l\subset\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ are arbitrary smooth functions of one real variable. Note that the parametrization obtained comprise hyperplanes.

Case 2: Suppose $\ddot{f}_i(x_i)=0$, $\forall\, i=1,\dots,n-r$, then, there are constants α_i such that $\dot{f}_i=\alpha_i$, for $i=1,\dots,n-r$. From (10) we have

$$\ddot{f}_{n-r+1}\dots\ddot{f}_n(1+\alpha_1^2+\dots+\alpha_{n-r}^2)=0,$$

from which we conclude that $\ddot{f}_k=0$ for some $k\in\{n-r+1,\dots n\}$ and thus, this case is contained in the Case 1.

Case 3: Now suppose $\ddot{f}_i(x_i)=0$, $\forall\, i=1,\dots,n-r-1$ and $\ddot{f}_k(x_k)\neq 0$, for every $k=n-r,\dots,n$. Observe that if we had $\ddot{f}_k(x_k)=0$ for some $k=n-r,\dots,n$ the analysis would reduce to the Cases 1 and 2. In this case, there are constants α_i such that $\dot{f}_i=\alpha_i$ for any $1\le i\le n-r-1$. From (10) we have

$$\sum_{k=n-r}^{n}\ddot{f}_{n-r}\dots\widehat{\ddot{f}_k}\dots\ddot{f}_n(\beta+\dot{f}_k^2)=0$$

where $\beta = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-r-1} \alpha_k^2$ and the hat means an omitted term. Then, from Lemma 1 we have that

$$\sum_{k=n-r}^{n} f_k(x_k) = \sum_{k=n-r}^{n-1} \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{a_k} \ln \left| \frac{\cos\left(-\dfrac{a_{n-r}\dots a_{n-1}}{\sigma_{r-1}(a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1})}\sqrt{\beta}x_n + b_n \right)}{\cos(a_k\sqrt{\beta}x_k + b_k)} \right| + c$$

where $a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1},b_{n-r},\dots,b_n$ and c are real constants, and $a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1}$, and $\sigma_{r-1}(a_{n-r},\dots,a_{n-1})$ are nonzero.

Case 4: Finally, suppose $\ddot{f}_i(x_i) = 0$, where $1 \le i \le k$ and $n-k \ge r+2$, and $\ddot{f}_i(x_i) \neq 0$ for any $i > k$. We will show that this case cannot occur. In fact, note that for any fixed $l \ge k+1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_r\le n} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_r}\Big(1 &+ \sum_{\substack{1\le m\le n\\ m\neq i_1,\dots i_r}} \dot{f}_m^2\Big) \\
&= \ddot{f}_l \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_{r-1}\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le n\\ m\neq l,i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}}} \dot{f}_m^2\Big) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots i_r\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_r\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_r}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le n\\ m\neq i_1,\dots i_r}} \dot{f}_m^2\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

Derivative with respect to the variable x_l ($l \ge k+1$), in the above equality, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dddot{f}_l \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_{r-1}\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}\Big(1 &+ \sum_{\substack{1\le m\le n\\ m\neq l,i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}}} \dot{f}_m^2\Big) \\
&+ 2\dot{f}_l\ddot{f}_l \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_r\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_r\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_r} = 0. \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

That is, if we set

$$\begin{aligned}
A_l &= \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_{r-1}\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le n\\ m\neq l,i_1,\dots,i_{r-1}}} \dot{f}_m^2\Big) \quad \text{and} \\
B_l &= \sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\dots<i_r\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_r\neq l}} \ddot{f}_{i_1}\dots\ddot{f}_{i_r}
\end{aligned}$$

then, it follows that A_l, B_l do not depend on the variable x_l and we can write

$$A_l\dddot{f}_l + 2B_l\dot{f}_l\ddot{f}_l = 0. \qquad (12)$$

We have two possible situations to take into account: **Case I.** $A_l \neq 0$, $\forall\, l \ge k+1$, and **Case II.** there is an $l \ge 1$ such that $A_l = 0$.

Case I. $A_l \neq 0$**:** Under this assumption, there are constants α_l ($l = k+1,\dots,n$) such that equation (12) becomes $\dddot{f}_l + 2\alpha_l\dot{f}_l\ddot{f}_l = 0$. Furthermore, it can be shown

that for $\{l_1,\dots,l_{r+1}\}\subset\{k+1,\dots,n\}$

$$\frac{\partial^{r+1}G_r(f_1,\dots,f_n)}{\partial x_{l_1}\cdots\partial x_{l_{r+1}}}=2\sum_{k=1}^{r+1}\left(\dot f_{l_k}\,\ddot f_{l_k}\prod_{\substack{m=1\\m\neq k}}^{r+1}\dddot f_{l_m}\right)\tag{13}$$

where

$$G_r(f_{k+1},\dots,f_n):=W^{r+2}S_r=\sum_{k+1\le i_1<\ldots<i_r\le n}\ddot f_{i_1}\dots\ddot f_{i_r}(1+\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le n\\ i\neq i_1,\dots,i_r}}\dot f_i^2).$$

Since $S_r=0$ it follows that $G_r=0$, and using that $\prod_{k=1}^{r+1}\dot f_{l_k}\,\ddot f_{l_k}\neq 0$ we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r+1}\left(\prod_{\substack{m=1\\m\neq k}}^{r+1}\frac{\dddot f_{l_m}}{\dot f_{l_m}\ddot f_{l_m}}\right)\;=\;\frac{\displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^{r+1}\left(\dot f_{l_s}\,\ddot f_{l_s}\prod_{\substack{m=1\\m\neq s}}^{r+1}\dddot f_{l_m}\right)}{\displaystyle\prod_{k=1}^{r+1}\dot f_{l_k}\,\ddot f_{l_k}}=0.\tag{14}$$

Now, for $l=l_1,\dots l_{r+1}$, substitute $\dddot f_l+2\alpha_l\dot f_l\ddot f_l=0$ in (14) to obtain the identity

$$\sigma_r(\alpha_{l_1},\dots,\alpha_{l_r},\alpha_{l_{r+1}})=0\tag{15}$$

for any $l_1,\dots,l_r,l_{r+1}\in\{k+1,\dots,n\}$. Hence we conclude that,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_r(\alpha_{k+1},\dots,\alpha_n)&=0\\ \sigma_{r+1}(\alpha_{k+1},\dots,\alpha_n)&=0.\end{aligned}$$

These equalities, from Proposition 1, imply that at most $r-1$ of the constants α_l $(l\ge k+1)$ are nonzero. If $\alpha_{l_1}\neq 0,\dots,\alpha_{l_m}\neq 0$ with $m\le r-1$, in the expression obtained for B_l, making $l\neq l_1,\dots,l_m$ and taking derivatives with respect to the variables $x_{l_1},\dots,x_{l_m}$ we get

$$\prod_{j=l_1}^{l_m}\dddot f_j\cdot\sigma_{r-m}(\ddot f_{k+1},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_l},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_1}},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_m}},\dots,\ddot f_n)=0$$

for all $l\in\{k+1,\dots,n\}\setminus\{l_1,\dots,l_m\}$. As $\dddot f_j\neq 0$ for all $j\in\{l_1\dots,l_m\}$, we obtain that

$$\sigma_{r-m}(\ddot f_{k+1},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_l},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_1}},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_m}},\dots,\ddot f_n)=0$$

for all $l\in\{k+1,\dots,n\}\setminus\{l_1,\dots,l_m\}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{r-m}(\ddot f_{k+1},,\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_1}},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_m}},\dots,,\ddot f_n)&=0\\ \sigma_{r-m+1}(\ddot f_{k+1},,\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_1}},\dots,\widehat{\ddot f_{l_m}},\dots,,\ddot f_n)&=0.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(n-k-m)-(r-m)=n-k-r\ge 2$, at most $r-m-1$ of the functions $\ddot f_l$ are nonzero, for $k+1\le l\le n$ and $l\neq l_1,\dots,l_m$, leading to a contradiction. So, $\alpha_j=0$ for all $j\in\{l_1\dots,l_{r-1}\}$, which implies that $\ddot f_l$ is constant for all $l\in\{k+1,\dots,n\}$. Now, again from equation (11) we get

$$\sum_{\substack{k+1\le i_1<\ldots<i_r\le n\\ i_1,\dots,i_r\neq l}}\ddot f_{i_1}\dots\ddot f_{i_r}=0,\qquad\text{for any } l\in\{k+1,\dots,n\}.$$

From which, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_r(\ddot{f}_{k+1},\ldots,\ddot{f}_n) &= 0\\ \sigma_{r+1}(\ddot{f}_{k+1},\ldots,\ddot{f}_n) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, at most $r-1$ of the functions $\ddot{f}_l$ $(k+1\leq l\leq n)$ are nonzero, leading to a contradiction. Thus, it follows that Case 4 cannot occur, if $A_l\neq 0$ for every l.

Case $A_l=0$**:** In this case, we have $B_l\dot{f}_l\ddot{f}_l=0$ implying

$$\begin{aligned}A_l &= \sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-1}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}\neq l}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{1\leq m\leq n\\ m\neq l,i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}}}\dot{f}_m^2\Big)=0 \quad \text{and}\\ B_l &= \sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_r\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_r\neq l}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_r}=0.\end{aligned}$$

Derivative of A_l with respect to variable x_s, for $s=k+1,\ldots,n$ and $s\neq l$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\dddot{f}_s\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-2}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-2}\neq l,s}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-2}}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq m\leq n\\ m\neq l,s,i_1,\ldots,i_{r-2}}}\dot{f}_m^2\Big)\\ &+2\dot{f}_s\ddot{f}_s\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-1}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}\neq l,s}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}=0.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Now, for $i_1,\ldots,i_r\in\{k+1,\ldots,n\}$ with $i_1,\ldots,i_r,l$ distinct indices, taking the derivatives of B_l with respect to $x_{i_1},\ldots,x_{i_r}$ gives

$$\dddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\dddot{f}_{i_r}=0.$$

Consequently, for at most $r-1$ indices, say $i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}$, we can have $\dddot{f}_{i_m}\neq 0$, $(m=1,\ldots,r-1)$, and $\dddot{f}_j=0$ for every $j=k+1,\ldots,n$, with $j\neq l,i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}$. Thus $\dddot{f}_{i_m}\neq 0$, with $i_m\neq l$, together with equation $\frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x_{i_m}}=0$ implies that the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-1}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}\neq l,i_m}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}=0.$$

Now, if $\dddot{f}_j=0$ we have by equation (16) that

$$\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-1}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}\neq l,j}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}=0.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{\substack{k+1\leq i_1<\ldots<i_{r-1}\leq n\\ i_1,\ldots,i_{r-1}\neq l,j}}\ddot{f}_{i_1}\ldots\ddot{f}_{i_{r-1}}=0,\quad j=k+1,\ldots,n \text{ and } j\neq l$$

From which, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{r-1}(\ddot{f}_{k+1},\ldots,\widehat{\ddot{f}}_l,\ldots,\ddot{f}_n) &= 0\\ \sigma_r(\ddot{f}_{k+1},\ldots,\widehat{\ddot{f}}_l,\ldots,\ddot{f}_n) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for at most $r-2$ $(r\geq 3)$ indices we must have $\ddot{f}_j\neq 0$, for every $j=k+1,\ldots,n$, and $j\neq l$. This contradicts the hypothesis assumed in Case 4. Hence, $A_l=0$ cannot

occur. Since the case $A_l \neq 0$, cannot occur as well, it follows that Case 4 is not possible. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $M^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a translation hypersurface with constant S_r curvature. First, note that

$$\frac{\partial^m W^{r+2}}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_m}} = \prod_{j=1}^{m}(r+4-2j) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{m} \dot{f}_k \, \ddot{f}_k \cdot W^{r+2-2m}. \tag{17}$$

We have as a consequence of the proof of Theorem 1, see (13), the identity

$$\frac{\partial^{r+1} G_r(f_1, \ldots, f_n)}{\partial x_{l_1} \cdots \partial x_{l_{r+1}}} = 2 \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \left(\dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k} \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{r+1} \dddot{f}_{l_m} \right)$$

where $G_r(f_1, \ldots, f_n) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_r \leq n} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r} (1 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq i_1, \ldots, i_r}} \dot{f}_i^2)$. With this we conclude, by Proposition 2, that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=1}^{r+1}(r+4-2j) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k} \cdot W^{-r} S_r &= \frac{\partial^{r+1} (W^{r+2} S_r)}{\partial x_{l_1} \cdots \partial x_{l_{r+1}}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \left(\dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k} \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{r+1} \dddot{f}_{l_m} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Now, we have two cases to consider: r odd and r even.

Case r odd: Suppose that there are $l_1, \ldots, l_{r+1}$ such that $\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k} \neq 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_r := \prod_{j=1}^{r+1}(r+4-2j) \cdot W^{-r} S_r &= 2 \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{r+1} \left(\dot{f}_{l_s} \, \ddot{f}_{l_s} \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq s}}^{r+1} \dddot{f}_{l_m} \right)}{\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \left(\prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{r+1} \frac{\dddot{f}_{l_m}}{\dot{f}_{l_m} \ddot{f}_{l_m}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial^{r+1} Q_r}{\partial x_{l_1} \cdots \partial x_{l_{r+1}}} = 0.$$

On the other hand, using (17) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^{r+1} Q_r}{\partial x_{l_1} \cdots \partial x_{l_{r+1}}} = \prod_{j=1}^{r+1}(r+4-2j) \prod_{i=1}^{r+1}(-r+2-2i) \prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \dot{f}_{l_k} \, \ddot{f}_{l_k} W^{-3r-2} S_r.$$

Since r is odd, we conclude that $r+4-2j \neq 0$ and $-r+2-2j \neq 0$, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and, therefore, $S_r = 0$.

Now, if for at most r indices we have $\ddot{f}_j \neq 0$ for example $j = l_1, \ldots, l_r$ then

$$W^{r+2} S_r = \ddot{f}_{l_1} \cdots \ddot{f}_{l_r} \alpha,$$

for some constant $\alpha \neq 0$. Thus,

$$(r+2) W^r \dot{f}_{l_1} \ddot{f}_{l_1} S_r = \dddot{f}_{l_1} \ddot{f}_{l_2} \cdots \ddot{f}_{l_r} \alpha.$$

If $\dddot{f}_{l_1} = 0$, then $S_r = 0$. Otherwise,

$$(r+2) W^{r+2} \dot{f}_{l_1} \ddot{f}_{l_1} S_r = \dddot{f}_{l_1} \ddot{f}_{l_2} \cdots \ddot{f}_{l_r} W^2 \alpha \quad \Rightarrow \quad (r+2) \dot{f}_{l_1} (\ddot{f}_{l_1})^2 = \dddot{f}_{l_1} W^2.$$

As $r > 1$ implies that W does not depend on the variables $x_{l_2}, \ldots, x_{l_n}$, it follows that $\ddot{f}_{l_2} = \cdots = \ddot{f}_{l_n} = 0$ leading to a contradiction.

Case r even: In this case, there is a natural $q \geq 2$ such that $r = 2q$. Then $r+1 \geq q+2$ and consequently

$$\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} (r+4-2k) = 0.$$

Therefore, by (18) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \left(\dot{f}_{l_k} \ddot{f}_{l_k} \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{r+1} \dddot{f}_{l_m} \right) = 0.$$

Suppose that there are $l_1, \ldots, l_{r+1}$ such that $\displaystyle\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \ddot{f}_{l_k} \neq 0$. In this case,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \left(\prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq k}}^{r+1} \frac{\dddot{f}_{l_m}}{\dot{f}_{l_m} \ddot{f}_{l_m}} \right) = 0.$$

We conclude that for each l_i there is a constant α_{l_i} such that $\dddot{f}_{l_i} = \alpha_{l_i} \dot{f}_{l_i} \ddot{f}_{l_i}$. Now, it is easy to verify (see (11)) that

$$\begin{aligned} (r+2) \dot{f}_{l_{r+1}} \ddot{f}_{l_{r+1}} W^r S_r &= \frac{\partial G_r(f_1, \ldots, f_n)}{\partial x_{l_{r+1}}} \\ &= \dddot{f}_{l_{r+1}} G_{r-1}(f_1, \ldots, \widehat{f_l}, \ldots, f_n) \\ &+ 2 \dot{f}_{l_{r+1}} \ddot{f}_{l_{r+1}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_r \leq n \\ i_1, \ldots, i_r \neq l_{r+1}}} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(r+2) W^r S_r = \alpha_{l_{r+1}} G_{r-1}(f_1, \ldots, \widehat{f}_{l_{r+1}}, \ldots, f_n) + 2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_r \leq n \\ i_1, \ldots, i_r \neq l_{r+1}}} \ddot{f}_{i_1} \ldots \ddot{f}_{i_r}.$$

Differentiating this identity with respect to the variable $x_{l_{r+1}}$, gives

$$(r+2)\, r\, \dot{f}_{l_{r+1}} \ddot{f}_{l_{r+1}} W^{r-2} S_r = 0 \quad \text{implying that} \quad S_r = 0.$$

Finally, suppose that for any $(r+1)$-tuple of indices, say $l_1, \ldots, l_{r+1}$ it holds that $\prod_{k=1}^{r+1} \ddot{f}_{l_k} = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{r+1}(\ddot{f}_1, \ldots, \ddot{f}_n) &= 0 \\ \sigma_{r+2}(\ddot{f}_1, \ldots, \ddot{f}_n) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Implying that at least $n-r$ derivatives $\ddot{f}_l$ vanish, i.e., there are at most r functions such that $\ddot{f}_j \neq 0$ for example $j = l_1, \ldots, l_r$. Thus, by Proposition 2

$$W^{r+2} S_r = \ddot{f}_{l_1} \cdots \ddot{f}_{l_r} \alpha$$

for some constant $\alpha \neq 0$. We conclude that $S_r = 0$ analogously to the way it was presented for the case r odd. □

4. Final remarks

The problem of classifying translation surfaces under curvature constraints is far from been complete. It is remarkable that the solutions give rise to generalized Scherk-like solutions and it would be interesting to understand which solutions could be obtained when considering other classes of curvature. Another problem to be considered consists in classify the translation n-surfaces of higher codimension or imbedded into other Riemann or semi-Riemannian manifolds.

References

[1] A. Caminha: *On spacelike hypersurfaces of constant sectional curvature lorentz manifolds*, J. of Geometry and Physics, **56** (2006), 1144–1174.

[2] C. Chen, H. Sun and L. Tang: *On translation Hypersurfaces with Constant Mean Curvature in $(n+1)$-Dimensional Spaces*, J. Beijing Inst. of Tech., **12** (n.3) (2003), 322–325.

[3] F. Dillen, L. Verstraelen and G. Zafindratafa: *A generalization of the translational surfaces of Scherk*, Differential Geometry in honor of Radu Rosca, Catholic University of Leuven - Belgium (1991), 107–109.

[4] M. L. Leite: *An example of a triply periodic complete embedded scalar-flat hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^4$*, Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências, **63** (1991), 383–385.

[5] B. P. Lima, N. L. Santos and P. A. Sousa: *Translation Hypersurfaces with Constant Scalar Curvature into the Euclidean Space*, Israel J. Math., to appear in Israel J. Math..

[6] H. Liu: *Translation Surfaces with Constant Mean Curvature in 3-Dimensional Spaces*, J. Geom. **64** (1999), 141–149.

[7] R. López: *Minimal translation surfaces in hyperbolic space*, Beitr. Algebra Geom. **52** (2011), 105–112.

[8] H. F. Scherk: *Bemerkungen über die kleinste Fläche innerhalb gegebener Grenzen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **13** (1835), 185–208.

[9] K. Seo: *Translation Hypersurfaces with Constant Curvature in Space Forms*, Osaka J. Math., **50** (2013), 631–641.

Universidade Federal do Piauí; Departamento de Matemática; 64049-550, Ininga - Teresina - PI; Brazil

E-mail address: barnabe@ufpi.edu.br[1]

E-mail address: newtonls@ufpi.edu.br[2]

E-mail address: jsilva@ufpi.edu.br[3]

E-mail address: paulosousa@ufpi.edu.br[4]